



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HR

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,556	09/30/2000	Yen-Kuang Chen	042390.P8657	6918
7590	12/15/2005		EXAMINER	
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025			DO, CHAT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/676,556	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chat C. Do	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 29-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 29-32, 34-37, 39-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 33,38 and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 09/26/2005.
2. Claims 29-43 are pending in this application. Claims 29, 34, and 39 are independent claims. This Office Action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 29-32, 34-37, and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Thuyen Le et al. ("A new flexible architecture for variable length DC targeting shape-adaptive transform") in view of Mogi et al. (U.S. 6,687,724).

Re claim 29, Thuyen Le et al. disclose a machine-implemented method (e.g. abstract) comprising: receiving a multimedia signal having data values (e.g. page 1949 first paragraph under the introduction section); forming the data values into a matrix of inputs [X] (e.g. x(n)); forming a matrix [A] of predetermined values (e.g. left column page 1950 lines 12-22) and multiplication operations (e.g. equation 2 in left column page 1950); factoring [A] into a butterfly matrix [B], a shuffle matrix [S], and a multiplication matrix [M] (e.g. as C(n), F of equation 3, S of equation 7, and P of equation 4

respectively), wherein the multiplication operations are selectively positioned into pairs within [M] (e.g. Figure 1 and left column page 1951 lines 3-7 wherein plurality of multiplications are performed by plurality of CFMB modules and the plurality of CFMB modules are parallel; CFMB-0 & CFMB-1; CFMB-2 & CFMB-3); and executing by a processor instruction (e.g. $P_{(x,y),7}$). Thuyen Le et al. do not disclose simultaneously executing multiplication operations on the grouped set of values using a Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD) instruction. However, Mogi et al. disclose in column 1 that the SIMD instruction is widely used to execute multiplication operations on a group set of values (e.g. col. 1 lines 40-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add the SIMD instruction to simultaneously executing multiplication operations on the grouped set of values as seen in Mogi et al.'s invention into Thuyen Le et al.'s invention because it would enable to increase the system performance by executing multiple data simultaneously and efficiently in matrix multiplication (e.g. col. 1 lines 40-55).

Re claim 30, Thuyen Le et al. do not disclose the SIMD is the Packed Multiply and Add (PMADDWD) instructions. However, Mogi et al. disclose in Figure 2 the SIMD is the PMADDWD instruction (col. 2 lines 5-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add the PMADDWD instructions as seen in Mogi et al. 's invention into Thuyen Le et al.'s invention because it would enable to increase the system performance by executing multiple data simultaneously (e.g. col. 1 lines 40-55).

Re claim 31, Thuyen Le et al. further disclose values within [B] and [S] are integers selected from the group consisting of 1, 0 and -1 (e.g. F and S matrices in page 1950).

Re claim 32, Thuyen Le et al. further disclose [A] is a 4-point Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) transformation matrix (e.g. abstract), [X] represents a time domain of a video signal, and [Y] represents a frequency domain of the video signal (e.g. first paragraph under introduction section in page 1949).

Re claim 34, it is a machine-readable medium having instructions claim of claim 29. Thus, claim 34 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 29.

Re claim 35, it is a machine-readable medium having instructions claim of claim 30. Thus, claim 35 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 30.

Re claim 36, it is a machine-readable medium having instructions claim of claim 31. Thus, claim 36 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 31.

Re claim 37, it is a machine-readable medium having instructions claim of claim 32. Thus, claim 37 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 32.

Re claim 39, it is a system claim of claim 29. Thus, claim 39 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 29.

Re claim 40, it is a system claim of claim 30. Thus, claim 40 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 30.

Re claim 41, it is a system claim of claim 31. Thus, claim 41 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 31.

Re claim 42, it is a system claim of claim 32. Thus, claim 42 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 32.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 33, 38, and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 09/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. The applicant argued in pages 6-7 for independent claims 29, 34, and 39 that the cited reference by Thuyen Le fails to disclose a butterfly matrix as cited in the claim invention.

The examiner respectfully submits that the primary reference by Thuyen Le expressively disclose the butterfly matrix while performing multiplication operations wherein the butterfly matrix is the "F" matrix in page 1950. As clearly cited in the left column of the same page, the F matrix involve with symmetry

form of cosine terms (e.g. second paragraph on the left column page 1950) and also each individual element of “F” matrix can be arbitrary assigned (e.g. paragraph right below the equation 3). Thus, matrix “F” is considered as the butterfly matrix, which is clearly met the claimed invention butterfly matrix in all independent claims.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chat C. Do whose telephone number is (571) 272-3721. The examiner can normally be reached on M => F from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2193

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chaki Kakali can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chat C. Do
Examiner
Art Unit 2193

December 2, 2005

Chaki C. Do

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100